

Applicant : Andreas Muth  
Appln. No. : 10/539,152  
Page : 8

Interview  
summary OK  
/PB/ 04 May  
2010

## REMARKS

Claims 41, 43, 44, 46-48 and 53-79 are pending in the present application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time for a telephone interview on January 20, 2010. As discussed in the interview, Applicant submits that a combination of U.S. Patent No. 2,997,096 to Morrison et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,045,316 to Gilhart would not result in a method that produces at least one permanent impression and/or deformation in an insulation blanket while insulation material is curing during its passage through a tunnel furnace as the pattern rolls 35 of the Gilhart '316 patent do not form any such impression and/or deformation during curing. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the current amendment to claim 41, which was suggested by the Examiner during the telephone interview, would overcome the present rejection as a combination of the references would not include a molding device within the tunnel furnace, wherein the molding device subjects the insulation material to the controlled compaction in such a manner to produce the at least one permanent impression and/or deformation and curing of the insulation material occurs while the insulation material abuts the molding device to subject the insulation material to the controlled compaction.

Claim 60 has been objected to for including language not found in the specification. Applicant has amended claim 60 and believes that the objection to claim 60 is now obviated.

Claims 41, 43, 44, 46-48 and 53-76 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. According to the Office Action, limitations cited in the claims are "not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention." The standard for rejecting claims as failing to comply with the written description requirement is described in MPEP §2163 as follows: